UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,248	09/30/2003	Peter K. Rogan	33026	5913
237761 7590 11/02/2009 ERICKSON, KERNELL, DERUSSEAU & KLEYPAS, LLC 800 W. 47TH STREET, SUITE 401			EXAMINER	
			POHNERT, STEVEN C	
KANSAS CITY, MO 64112		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/676,248	ROGAN ET AL.
Examiner-initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	STEVEN C. POHNERT	1634
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>STEVEN C. POHNERT</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Tracy Truitt</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 October 2009	Time: <u>11:00</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Sequence compliance		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted applicant's representative about the reponse filed 7/23/2009. The examiner noted that the remarks stated there was a new sequence listing and specification to adress the sequence compliance rules, but no such files appeared in the file. The examiner then suggested he would sending out a communication stating there was a bona fide attempt at the response but there was a discrepancy between the remarks and the filing. Applicant's representative agreed to this mode of action.